

WWJMRD 2017; 3(7): 221-226
www.wwjmr.com
Impact Factor MJIF: 4.25
e-ISSN: 2454-6615

Peter Obeng Manu Tutu
Department of Religious
Education, Valley View
University, Techiman Campus,
Techiman, Ghana

Kenneth Oppong
Department of Religious
Education, Valley View
University, Techiman Campus,
Techiman, Ghana

Biblical Inerrancy: A Reflection

Peter Obeng Manu, Kenneth Oppong

Abstract

For two thousand years in the history of the church, the authority of the Bible was not questioned. However, for more than two centuries, an assault on the reliability of Scripture has come in relentless waves from influential voices on the margins of the evangelical movement. Biblical inerrancy has, therefore, become a subject of discussion for the past two centuries among scholars. The purpose of this paper is to revisit the issue of biblical inerrancy to present the arguments for and against the subject. The paper will make clear whether the Bible is errant or inerrant. It will further help its readers to approach it as the authoritative source of truth revealing God's will and the plan of redemption He has laid in place for mankind. The paper concluded that the Bible is without mistakes and errors. Its origination is a firm assurance to its inerrancy. A true God who seeks the salvation of His children will not watch for false accounts containing the plan of salvation to be presented to them. It was made clear that biblical inerrancy has a link with God and His plan to save mankind. When it is rejected, it will put God's plan to save mankind in danger. Therefore, biblical inerrancy should be held in high esteem.

Keywords: reflection, history, Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, argument, biblical inerrancy, salvation

Introduction

The word 'Bible' derives its etymology from the Greek 'biblios' and Latin 'biblia' both of which means 'the book'.¹ The word Bible has become synonymous with the sixty-six canonized books of the Christian Scriptures, the Old and New Testaments, God's written word in human language. Being moved by the Holy Spirit, holy men of God spoke and wrote the messages God gave them. As an infallible book, the Bible has been accepted as the standard of character and as the authoritative source of all doctrines.² The Bible was written by about forty people in three languages- Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. The writers were of different literary backgrounds, experiences and geographical locations, yet they did not contradict themselves in the presentation of their messages. Though the Bible was written by men, it has come to be called the word of God. This name signifies the source and the origin of the messages of the Bible. God was the source of the messages. Trying to reach out and communicate with mankind, He called these holy men and used them as His penmen. Documenting these revealed words of God, these holy men used their own style and choice of words. They chose words and expressions their audience could best understand. Though the words were not dictated to them, God guided their thoughts and directed their minds as to what to write and record. God was fully in charge in the production and preservation of the Bible. The Bible with its divine and human nature has been trusted as an infallible word of God for ages. The Jews accepted the Old Testament as inspired word of God free from errors. "Lord Jesus during His earthly ministry reminded His disciples that heaven and earth shall pass away, but even a jot or tittle from the Scripture shall not pass away."³ Many have lost their lives for the trust they had in the Bible. Wars have been waged against the Bible, yet it has stood as an untainted word of God through the ages.⁴ But in the 1800 and 1900 the infallibility and the inerrancy of the Bible became a subject of controversy. This controversy

Correspondence:

Peter Obeng Manu Tutu
Department of Religious
Education, Valley View
University, Techiman Campus,
Techiman, Ghana

¹T.H Jemison, *Christian Beliefs* (Mountain View, California: Pacific Press, 1959), 12

² Seventh-day Adventist, *An Exposition of the Fundamental Beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church* (Silver Spring, MD: Pacific Press, 2005), 11.

³ Johnson C. Philip and Saneesh Cherian, *The Inerrancy of the Bible* (n. p: 2006), 3.

⁴ Seventh-day Adventist, 11.

was initiated by variety of radical thinkers, “first in Europe, then in USA, and after that in the rest of the world.” Thus, the issue of biblical inerrancy has become a worldwide phenomenon from 1900 down through the centuries.⁵ The attempt to overthrow the unique position the Bible has in the Christian communities has led thinkers in non-Christian religions to attack the inerrancy of the Bible.⁶

What is biblical inerrancy? When did the debate over biblical inerrancy start? What are the arguments for and against biblical inerrancy? What are the implications for denying biblical inerrancy? These questions need to be addressed.

The purpose of this paper is to revisit the issue of biblical inerrancy to present the arguments for and against the subject. The paper will investigate whether the Bible is errant or inerrant. It will further address the confusion held about the trustworthiness of the Bible. Making clear the inerrancy of the Bible, it will help increase the trust its readers have for the it. This will help Bible readers to approach it as the authoritative source of truth revealing God’s will and the plan of redemption He has laid in place for mankind.

The paper is preceded by the definition of biblical inerrancy. A history of biblical inerrancy will be discussed next. Then the arguments for and against biblical inerrancy will be considered. A summary of the Chicago Statement of Biblical Inerrancy will also be looked at. Furthermore, problems associated with the denial of biblical inerrancy will be put in perspective. Finally, the paper will be concluded and a position taken on the subject under consideration.

Biblical Inerrancy

For two thousand years in the history of the church, the authority of the Bible was not questioned. However, “for more than two centuries, an assault on the reliability of Scripture has come in relentless waves from influential voices on the margins of the evangelical movement.”⁷ Biblical inerrancy has, therefore, become a subject of discussion for the past two centuries among scholars. A lot of the problem in the debate has been due to misunderstanding of the word ‘inerrancy’ and what people mean when they use it.⁸ Therefore, to set this in perspective biblical inerrancy must be well defined.

Biblical Inerrancy: What is it?

“Inerrancy” comes from the word “inerrant” and it is defined as “that does not err; free from error; unerring”⁹ Infallibility is another word that is used to characterize the Bible. Infallibility and inerrancy are sometimes used interchangeably. For John M. Frame infallibility is stronger than inerrant. “‘Inerrant’ means there are no errors; ‘infallible’ means there can be no errors”¹⁰ Paul Helm commenting on the two terms asserts that:

“‘Inerrancy’ focuses our attention exclusively on questions of truth and falsehood, whereas the older term, ‘infallibility,’ when applied to Scripture, lays emphasis

upon the fact that the Bible is an unfailing guide to whoever may read it, and especially to the Christian and the church, for the purpose for which it was given.”¹¹

According to Wayne Grudem “the inerrancy of Scripture means that Scripture in the original manuscripts does not affirm anything that is contrary to fact.”¹² He further added that “in simple terms... the Bible always tells the truth... concerning everything it talks about.”¹³ Tim Challies commenting on this definition mentions that, “So what we affirm in this definition, is that a perfect God moved human authors, by His Spirit, to perfectly transcribe what He wanted to communicate. It is important to note that this definition does not apply to the transmission of Scripture through the ages and the translation into other languages. We affirm that only the original autographs are inerrant.”¹⁴

By summing up what biblical inerrancy is, it is sensible to support the position that the Bible “is without error or fault in all its teaching”¹⁵ Basically, the position that the Bible is inerrant means that the Bible is free from errors and, thus, we can trust it as an authentic word of God communicated to us in human language. The Bible originating from an inerrant God renders it inerrant. It must also be noted that biblical inerrancy is applied only to the original manuscript of the Bible known as the autographs: the original scripts of the Bible by the writers.

The idea that the Bible is inerrant has become a subject for debate. There was a time the Bible was held as the authoritative word of God. Its authenticity and authority was never questioned. When, then, did this debate of biblical inerrancy start. The subsequent discussion examines the history of the debate over biblical inerrancy.

A History of the Debate over Biblical Inerrancy

In the first century or before, there was no debate on the inerrancy of the Bible. The Bible was seen as “perfect, and exactly as if it had been spoken by God, trumping anything else.”¹⁶ But in the 1800 and 1900 the controversy over the inerrancy of the Bible sparked. This controversy was initiated by variety of radical thinkers in Europe and America.¹⁷ During this time, some of the biblical events were questioned. For example Noah’s worldwide flood.¹⁸ The six literal day creation and the woman being created from the man’s rib were seen as myths. The authenticity of other biblical texts were further questioned. Coleman in an article he wrote in *Theology Today* said “there have been long periods in the history of the church when biblical inerrancy has not been a critical question. It has in fact been noted that only in the last two centuries can we legitimately speak of a formal doctrine of inerrancy. The arguments pro and con have filled many books, and almost anyone can join in the debate”¹⁹

In the 1970s and 1980s, however, the debate in theological

⁵ Philip and Cherian, *Inerrancy*, 3.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 3-4.

⁷ John MacArthur, ed. *The Scripture Cannot Be Broken* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2015), 9.

⁸ Matthew John Churchouse, “Defining and Refining Inerrancy: Revisiting the Doctrine for the 21st Century,” (Mphil. Thesis, University of Birmingham, 2009), 70.

⁹ “Biblical inerrancy,” Wikipedia, accessed 22 August 2016, <http://www.en.wikipedia.org>.

¹⁰ John M. Frame, “Is the Bible Inerrant?” *IHM Magazine Online*, Volume 4, Number 19, May 13-20, 2002.

¹¹ Paul Helm, “B. B. Warfield’s Path to Inerrancy: An Attempt to Correct Some Serious Misunderstandings,” *Westminster Theological Journal* (2010), 25.

¹² Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1994; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan 2000), 90.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 91.

¹⁴ Tim Challies, “the Inerrancy of Scripture,” accessed on 23 August 2016, <http://www.fivesolas.com/inerrancy.htm>.

¹⁵ Norman L. Geisler, and Roach, B., *Defending Inerrancy: Affirming the Accuracy of Scripture for a New Generation*, Baker Books, 2012.

¹⁶ Kris Beckert, “Scriptural Pursuit,” accessed on 23 August 2016, <http://manaz.org/filerequest/2255.pdf>.

¹⁷ Philip and Cherian, *Inerrancy*, 3.

¹⁸ Wikipedia.

¹⁹ R. J. Coleman, “Biblical Inerrancy: Are We Going Anywhere?,” *Theology Today* 31 (1975), 295.

circles, which centered on the issue of whether or not the Bible was infallible or both infallible and inerrant, came into the spotlight. Some notable Christian seminaries, such as Princeton Theological Seminary and Fuller Theological Seminary, were formally adopting the doctrine of infallibility while rejecting the doctrine of inerrancy.²⁰

For many historians the biblical inerrancy debate began among the evangelicals in the late 19th century. B. B. Warfield an American conservative theologian of his time, debated extensively in favour of biblical inerrancy. But he was opposed by James Orr who insisted on limited inerrancy.²¹ Supporting Orr, G. C. Berkouwer argued against Warfield's view of biblical inerrancy. His argument remains as perhaps the strongest arguments yet for limited inerrancy.²² "The debate began to heat up in the 1960s, when Dewey M. Beegle published a scathing attack on inerrancy."²³ Thus, from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries downwards biblical inerrancy has been a subject of debate among theologians and scholars.

Argument for Biblical Inerrancy

Various theories and arguments have been presented in defense of biblical inerrancy. They are; slippery-slope argument, epistemological argument, historical argument and biblical argument.

The Slippery-Slope Argument: Proponents of this argument simply posit that "if one gives up the inerrancy of scripture they also surrender other Christian doctrines as well."²⁴ Lindsell, a most noted inerrantist, explained it this way:

History affords us notable examples of institutions and denominations that have gone astray. At times it is not easy to perceive how this happened. The trend away from orthodoxy maybe slow in movement, gradual in its scope, and almost invisible to the naked eye. When people awaken to what has happened, it is too late. . . . Theological aberration, like cancer, begins as a small and seemingly insignificant blemish, but when it is left to itself it grows and spreads.²⁵

Pinnock shares a similar view. He says "Inerrancy is . . . urgent for Protestants because the sola scriptura principle cannot be maintained without it. An erring authority cannot serve as the only source and judge of Christian theology."²⁶ This argument for biblical inerrancy is weak. Andrew evaluating this argument in his article on biblical inerrancy said "it is not self-evidently true that once an orthodox individual or institution denies inerrancy he or it is ultimately bound to abandon orthodoxy."²⁷ Citing an example, he stated "inerrancy does not even guarantee orthodoxy for its adherents: Jehovah's Witnesses, hardly an orthodox group, hold strenuously to biblical inerrancy."²⁸ This means that it is possible for any institution or individual to deny biblical inerrancy and hold

on to other biblical doctrines. In spite of Andrew's position, this argument is sound because if we cannot trust the Bible how can its teachings and doctrines be adhered to. It is when the Bible is trustworthy that its readers will see its teachings as authoritative in their lives.

The Epistemological Argument: This argument says that "if the Bible is not inerrant, then any claim it makes maybe be false. This argument holds that every statement made in Scripture must be true for the entire text to be inerrant."²⁹ Lindsell explains it this way, "if even one of its (i.e., the Bible's) statements could be in error, the truth of any of its statements becomes questionable."³⁰ In other words, all statements of the Bible must be without error for it to be inerrant. Andrew further explained "once inerrancy is surrendered, all of Scripture becomes suspect in regards to trustworthiness."³¹ Giving more insight on this argument wrote Pinnock:

The result of denying inerrancy, as skeptics well know, is the loss of a trustworthy Bible. Limited inerrancy is a slope, not a platform. Although we are repeatedly assured that minor errors in unimportant matters would not greatly affect the substance of the Christian faith nor the authority of Scripture, this admission has the effect of leaving us with a Bible which is a compound of truth and error, with no one to tell us which is which.³²

Andrew was on point who in evaluating this argument of biblical inerrancy wrote:

I agree with this logic. That is, the presence of one error in Scripture would not necessarily mean that there are others. What it *would* mean is that we could not be sure, in any given passage, whether the information is true or not. The introduction of uncertainty does undermine the plenary trustworthiness of the Word of God.³³

The Historical Argument: This argument assumes that "the Bible is inerrant because from the Apostles all the way throughout Church history, the truths in the Bible were assumed, not defended."³⁴ This argument simply maintains that since the church fathers and the reformers did not question the inerrancy of the Bible, it renders the Bible inerrant. Thus the church has historically believed in the inerrancy of Scripture, and thus it is a doctrine with long-standing support in tradition. For Andrew, "this fact alone does not prove anything. After all, many Church Fathers held to baptismal regeneration, and we think that is hardly correct. Ultimately, the historical argument becomes a fallacious appeal to authority."³⁵ This argument may not be strong enough, but it is still an important point to take into account when discussing biblical inerrancy.

The Biblical Argument: This argument simply states that we should believe in inerrancy because the Bible teaches its own inerrancy. We should accept the Bible's claim about itself. This argument advocates that the Bible originated from God and, since, God is truth it renders the Bible as an absolute truth. If God does not lie, His words cannot too. Speaking to this wrote Andrew, "all arguments for

²⁰ "Biblical Inerrancy," Wikipedia accessed 23 August 2016, <http://www.en.wikipedia.org>.

²¹ Stephen L. Andrew, "Biblical Inerrancy," *Chafer Theological Seminary Journal* 8 (January–March 2002), 4.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Feinberg, P.D. "Bible, Inerrancy and Infallibility of." in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Elwell, A. Walter. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book house Company, 2001), 158.

²⁵ Harold Lindsell, *the Battle for the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 185.

²⁶ Clark H. Pinnock, *Biblical Revelation—the Foundation of Christian Theology* (Chicago: Moody, 1971), 74.

²⁷ Andrew, 9.

²⁸ Ibid., 14.

²⁹ Feinberg, P.D. "Bible, Inerrancy and Infallibility of." in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Elwell, A. Walter. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book house Company, 2001), 157.

³⁰ Lindsell, 220.

³¹ Andrew, 10.

³² Pinnock, 80.

³³ Andrew, 10.

³⁴ *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, 157.

³⁵ Andrew, 11.

inerrancy of which I am aware admit that Scripture does not explicitly claim inerrancy for itself. Nevertheless, arguments have been put forward for its implicit claims.”³⁶To make more clearly biblical argument of inerrancy, He continued:

Perhaps the most common passage used to support inerrancy is 2 Timothy 3:16, which teaches that all Scripture is inspired by God. 2 Peter 1:20-21 teaches that Scripture originates not with human will, but with God’s will. When we combine these two passages with Numbers 23:19, 1 Samuel 15:29, Titus 1:2, and Hebrews 6:18 (these latter four passages all teach that God does not lie), we can legitimately deduce that there are no errors in Scripture.³⁷

He further added:

In Matthew 5:18, Jesus states that not one letter, not one stroke of a letter, will pass from the law until all is accomplished. In John 10:35, Jesus bases his argument from Psalm 82:6 on the fact that the scripture cannot be annulled. Both of these passages teach that Scripture (in these cases, the Old Testament) is authoritative—even its jots, tittles, and the least of [the] commandments (Matthew 5:19).³⁸

For Pinnock “if one believes the Scripture to be God’s Word, he cannot fail to believe it inerrant.”³⁹ Wayne A. Grudem shared a similar view. He wrote:

For it to be eternally useful for edification, God’s word must be an abiding testimony to the veracity of God’s speech: Untruthful statements would be unprofitable and bring dishonor to God by portraying Him as one who at times speaks untruthfully, and they would serve as an encouragement to people to imitate God and sometimes speak untruthfully as well.⁴⁰

Bible argument is, thus, the best and more convincing argument for biblical inerrancy. The Bible is its best advocate, and it implicitly and explicitly claim its inerrancy. “Repeatedly, the Scriptures teach that God cannot lie...If, then, the Bible is from God and his character is behind it, it must be inerrant and infallible.”⁴¹

The Arguments against Biblical Inerrancy

Some think that the Bible is full of errors and inconsistencies and, thus, see it as an errant book. What informs such a position? The following are the arguments advanced in favour of such a position.

The Bible is not scientifically reliable: Those who argue against biblical inerrancy posit that “the Bible is full of scientific errors and therefore cannot be trusted in spiritual matters either.”⁴² They question the truth of the sun standing still, the Israelites being fed with manna on the wilderness and how Jonah survived that three days in the belly of the fish.⁴³

The Bible is historically inaccurate: Anytime archeology or ancient history seems to contradict with biblical records, those who do not believe in biblical inerrancy conclude that the Bible is wrong. “Unless every biblical name is

authenticated through research and every fact verified historical study, they assume that the Bible is in error.”⁴⁴

The Bible is outdated: Those who do not believe in biblical inerrancy claim that the Bible was written many years ago, therefore, it has no relevance for our day. Simply, the Bible cannot be our guide because its principles are outdated.⁴⁵

The Bible is the work of man: The Bible is held by those who reject biblical inerrancy as the product of man’s imagination and created stories. They see the Bible as man’s word rather than God’s word. To them, the Bible is just any other religious book like those of Mohammed and Confucius.⁴⁶ In other words, what they mean is that if the Bible is just another religious book then it cannot guide us into the way of salvation.

Their arguments may sound logical, but then the unique nature of the Bible and the God it reveals is not well understood by these scholars. These arguments are not tenable because they operate within different presuppositions. They evaluate spiritual truths in terms of human reasoning and the natural environment, this is natural theology. Moreover, the Bible standing as untainted word of God through the ages, in spite of the wars waged against it, is evidence of its uniqueness.

The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy

In 1978, International Council on Biblical Inerrancy (ICBI) was formed to defend the inerrancy of the Bible. The Council released its famous Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy. The Statement consists of three parts: a summary Statement, articles of affirmation and denial, and an accompanying exposition. Consider the statement the Council gave on biblical inerrancy. It states:

1. God, who is Himself Truth and speaks truth only, has inspired Holy Scripture in order thereby to reveal Himself to lost mankind through Jesus Christ as Creator and Lord, Redeemer and Judge. Holy Scripture is God’s witness to Himself.
2. Holy Scripture, being God’s own Word, written by men prepared and superintended by His Spirit, is of infallible divine authority in all matters upon which it touches: it is to be believed, as God’s instruction, in all that it affirms; obeyed, as God’s command, in all that it requires; embraced, as God’s pledge, in all that it promises.
3. The Holy Spirit, Scripture’s divine Author, both authenticates it to us by His inward witness and opens our minds to understand its meaning.
4. Being wholly and verbally God-given, Scripture is without error or fault in all its teaching, no less in what it states about God’s acts in creation, about the events of world history, and about its own literary origins under God, than in its witness to God’s saving grace in individual lives.
5. The authority of Scripture is inescapably impaired if this total divine inerrancy is in any way limited or disregarded, or made relative to a view of truth contrary to the Bible’s own; and such lapses bring serious loss to both the individual and the Church.⁴⁷

³⁶Ibid., 12.

³⁷ Andrew, 12.

³⁸Ibid., 13.

³⁹ Pinnock, 74.

⁴⁰ Wayne A. Grudem, “Scripture’s Self-Attestation and the Problem of Formulating a Doctrine of Scripture,” in *Scripture and Truth*, ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 44.

⁴¹ Evangelical Dictionary of Theology, 158.

⁴²David Sper, ed., *Can I Really Trust the Bible?* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Thomas Nelson, 2003), 2.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴Ibid., 3.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶Sper, 3.

⁴⁷MacArthur.

Tracing the source of the Bible as being from a Holy and unerring God, the Council asserted that the Bible cannot err. The Bible writers, being inspired by the Spirit of God, wrote nothing but the truth. The Bible, therefore, should be seen and held as an infallible word of God. This the Council defended.

Implications for Denying the Inerrancy of the Bible

What does it imply to deny the Bible's claim of inerrancy? Consider the ramifications when biblical inerrancy is rejected.

It will render God as a Liar: If the Bible contains error then God is a liar because He is the source of the Bible messages. Speaking to this issue, Challies said:

If there are errors in the original manuscripts that were breathed out by God one of two things must be true: either God purposely lied or he mistakenly lied. This indicates that God is capable of making errors or of producing errors. We might conclude from this that we are likewise able to intentionally lie, even if only in small matters.⁴⁸

Men will lose their trust in God: The claim of biblical inerrancy simply means that we cannot trust God and what He says. Challies explains meticulously:

If there are errors in Scripture, even if in the smallest detail, and these were placed there intentionally by God, how are we to maintain trust that He did not lie in other matters? When we lose trust in the Scriptures, we lose trust in God Himself and we may consequently lose our desire to be obedient to Him.⁴⁹

Human mind will become the source of authority: If the agenda to refute biblical inerrancy is succeeded, it implies that God cannot be the source authority in any matter of human endeavor and the human mind will become autonomous and the sole dictator of issues of human life. "If we deny the clear testimony of Scripture that it is inerrant, we make our minds a higher standard of Truth than the Bible."⁵⁰

Lastly, it will lead to the rejection of other biblical doctrines. Challies points out that "if we deny inerrancy, and indicate that small details are incorrect, we cannot consistently argue that all the doctrine the Bible contains is correct. Admitting error in even the smallest historical detail is the thin edge of the wedge, for we then allow the possibility that there may be error in doctrine as well."⁵¹

Commenting on the problems associated with denying biblical inerrancy, Valley Bible Church has this to say: When people deny the inerrancy of the Bible they attack: The character of the Father who originated the Word; the reliability of the Son who affirmed the Word; the ministry of the Holy Spirit who inspired the Word; the stability of the Church which is built on the Word.⁵²

There can be no doubt that when the inerrancy of the Bible is rejected, it will really cause a great harm. It will, consequently, put the doctrine of the Godhead in jeopardy. When the doctrine of the Godhead becomes tampered, the salvation of mankind is what will be at stake.

Summary and Conclusion

So far the issue of Biblical inerrancy has been revisited and in terms of definition put in perspective. A history of the debate over the biblical inerrancy has been addressed and various arguments in defense of and against biblical inerrancy examined. Also, a summary of the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy was provided to support biblical inerrancy. Again, the implication of rejecting the Bible's claim of inerrancy has been addressed in this paper. Finally, the paper was summed up and a personal view on biblical inerrancy was clearly stated with a reason.

It is therefore the cherished opinion of this paper that the Bible is without mistakes and errors. Its origination is a firm assurance to its inerrancy. A true God who seeks the salvation of His children will not watch for false accounts of the plan of salvation to be presented to them. The Bible itself gives enough evidence to its inerrancy. We, therefore, say that it is easier to accept the Bible's claim of inerrancy than to believe in the philosophical arguments presented against it. We are of the strong viewpoint that the Bible is inerrant. The rejection of biblical inerrancy will lead to the rejection of the authority of the Bible which will in the long run lead to the rejection of all biblical doctrines because the Bible will be seen as a falsified book which cannot be trusted. If the Bible contains errors then it cannot be mankind's sufficient guide to salvation, thus jeopardizing the plan of redemption. Also, the rejection of biblical inerrancy means that God is a liar, and thus, cannot be trusted. If this is the case then God and His plan of redemption cannot be reliable. We see that biblical inerrancy has a link with God and His plan to save mankind. When it is rejected, it will put God's plan to save mankind in danger. Therefore, biblical inerrancy should be held in high esteem. Consequently, we recommend to those who read the Bible to see it as a trustworthy account about their salvation from a trustworthy God.

Bibliography

1. Andrew, Stephen L. "Biblical Inerrancy." *Chafer Theological Seminary Journal* 8. January–
2. March 2002.
3. Beckert, Kris. "Scriptural Pursuit." Accessed on 23 August 2016.
4. <http://manaz.org/filerequest/2255.pdf>.
5. "Biblical inerrancy." Wikipedia. Accessed 22 August 2016. <http://www.en.wikipedia.org>.
6. Carson, D. A., and John Woodbridge, eds. *Scripture and Truth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1992.
7. Churchouse, Matthew John. "Defining and Refining Inerrancy: Revisiting the Doctrine for the 21st Century." Mphil. Thesis, University of Birmingham, 2009.
8. Coleman, R. J. "Biblical Inerrancy: Are We Going Anywhere?" *Theology Today* 31. 1975.
9. Frame, John M. "Is the Bible Inerrant?" *IIM Magazine Online*. Volume 4. Number 19. May 13-20, 2002.
10. Grudem, Wayne A. "Scripture's Self-Attestation and the Problem of Formulating a Doctrine of
11. Scripture." in *Scripture and Truth*. Ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge. Grand
12. Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.
13. Jemison, T.H. *Christian Beliefs*. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press, 1959.
14. MacArthur, John, ed. *The Scripture Cannot Be Broken*.

⁴⁸ Challies.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Challies.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Valley Bible Church, *the Inerrancy of the Bible*, 3, accessed 23 August, 2016, <http://www.valleybible.net/PositionPapers/Inerrancy.pdf>.

- Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2015.
15. P.D. Feinberg. "Bible, Inerrancy and Infallibility of." in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Ed.
 16. Elwell, A. Walter. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book house Company, 2001.
 17. Philip, Johnson C. and Saneesh Cherian. *The Inerrancy of the Bible*. n. p: 2006.
 18. Sper, David,ed. *Can I Really Trust the Bible?* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Thomas Nelson, 2003.
 19. Valley Bible Church.*The Inerrancy of the Bible*. Accessed 23 August, 2016.
 20. <http://www.valleybible.net/PositionPapers/Inerrancy.pdf>.
 21. Warfield, B.B. *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1948.